

Remarks

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the following remarks. For the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is allowable over the cited references.

The non-final Office Action dated February 12, 2004, indicated that claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over *Williams et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,218,228); and claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Williams et al.* in view of *Blanchard* (U.S. Patent No. 4,345,265).

Applicant respectfully traverses the Section 102(b) and 103(a) rejections because the Office Action fails to show correspondence between each of the claimed limitations and the cited '228 reference. More specifically, the '228 reference appears to be unrelated to the instant invention as the Office Action fails to identify where and how various aspects of the claimed first, second, and third semiconductor regions correspond to the '228 reference, and where these limitations are taught in the '228 reference, *e.g.*, relative to the claimed "partial region with a smaller flux of dopant atoms" in the second semiconductor region. With or without the rationale provided in the Office Action, the '228 discussion of figure 6 does not appear to include any teachings that would correspond to the claimed invention.

As another example and with particular respect to claims 7 and 8, the Office Action fails to identify correspondence to the claim limitations involving a partial region that has a smaller thickness than the remainder of the region as claimed.

As Applicant fails to recognize a correlation between the instant invention and the '228 reference, and there is no presentation of prior-art correspondence to each of the claimed limitations, the Section 102(b) and 103(a) rejections cannot stand. Applicant accordingly requests that the rejections be withdrawn.


Applicant has amended claim 6 to improve the antecedent basis for the claimed other part of the second semiconductor region and not for any reasons related to patentability.

In view of the remarks above, Applicant believes that each of the rejections has been overcome and the application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any remaining issues that could be readily addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the agent overseeing the application file, Mr. Peter Zawilski, of Philips Corporation at (408) 474-9063.

Please direct all correspondence to:

Corporate Patent Counsel
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
1000 West Maude Ave., W2-755
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-2810

By: 
Name: Robert J. Crawford
Reg. No.: 32,122
(VLSI.411PA)

CUSTOMER NO. 24738